Rao Sahib I. N. Menon *(Director of Public Instruction):* (*a*) Yes.
(*b*) No.
(*c*) Does not arise.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHELTERS—ERNAKULAM AND MATTANCHERI

80. Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Will Government kindly state whether they are contemplating the construction of shelters in the sheds constructed for the use of evacuees from the towns of Ernakulam and Mattancheri?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon *(Chief Engineer):* The question of constructing a few shelters near the evacuation sheds at Palluruthi, Vyttila and Ponnuruni is under consideration.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* May I know, Sir, whether the Government is considering as to whether shelters are necessary for all the evacuees, or only for some?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon *(Chief Engineer):* It would be best if it is possible to construct shelters for all the evacuees. But in Palluruthi, space does not permit for constructing shelters for all of them. In Vyttila it is possible.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* May I know, Sir, whether the shelters built in Mattancheri are capable of being used as such.

Mr. President: This question does not deal with shelters in Ernakulam or Mattancheri. That is not the point.

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

16. Law and Justice—Rs. 2,01,523

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 2,01,523 under 15—Law and Justice. The budget relating to this department is a routine one and there is no particular feature in it to which I should draw your attention. The House may therefore be pleased to sanction the grant.

CUT MOTION No. 1

The delay in publishing Cochin Law Reports

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Cheruthuruthi):* I move, *to reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,849 for Establishment, Civil Justice—High Court, by Re. 1. The object is to bring to the notice of the Government the delay in publishing the Cochin Law Reports.* Cochin Law Reports are published quarterly and the subscription is always paid in advance. Only the first part was published this year although we are at the fag end of the fourth quarter. There are private publications of the reports of the High Court and I think the latest part we have got is that of Mithunam. 11 Parts have been published this year, whereas the reports of the first three months are publised in the Government Gazette. I want to know what the delay is due to. There is a special Law Reporter who is paid a handsome allowance of Rs. 75 a month and there is also an efficient Government Press. Besides the inconvenience caused to the public on account of the delay in publishing these reports, the Government stands to lose some money, as I am sure it will be evident from the decrease in the number of subscribers to the Cochin Law Reports—Government publications, after the starting of the private publications of the Law reports. I therefore bring this to the notice of the Government and tell them that unless they are going to publish more promptly, if possible, even monthly, I think it would be better for them to stop the publication and save money and ask some authorities to publish for them. I therefore request the Government to consider the matter seriously and do the needful.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, there is truth in the statement made by the Hon'ble Member that there has been delay in the publication of parts II and III of the Cochin Law Reports. Under the Rules framed by the High Court, it is laid down that within two months after the termination of a quarter, the Law Report of that quarter should be published. It is only with regard to parts 2 and 3 that there has been delay and it was due to the fact that the High Court was closed this year earlier for the mid-summer. There was no sitting at all in Meenam. The reports for Chingam, Kanni and Thulam have been published in time. The reports for Vrischigam, Dhanu and Makaram should have been published in the month of Meenam. But as a matter of fact, the court happened to be closed on the 1st Meenam and all the records together with the library of the High Court had to be transferred to distant places. That was the reason why parts 2 and 3 were not published in time as usual. Care has been taken to see that these publications are pushed through. Hon'ble Members are aware that you are attending to several pieces of important legislation on account of the situation created by the war. There has therefore been heavy work in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government Press. The reports could be given to the Press only after scrutiny by the learned Judges. They have been given to the Press early in Mithunam and orders have been issued to see that the publication is pushed through. It was only under these exceptional circumstances which were accidental and unanticipated that the publication of parts 2 and 3 have been delayed. I hope the House will be satisfied with this explanation.

Mr. A. L. Antony *(Irinjalakkuda):* May I know, Sir, whether this two months' rule is applicable strictly?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Rules have been framed and published in the Civil Rules of Practice.

Mr. A. L. Antony *(Irinjalakkuda):* Then what is the reason for allowing this two months?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* The learned Judges have to decide which of the decided cases, the Head Notes prepared are to be reported by the Law Reporter must be scrutinised by the Judges, and if there is difference of opinion in the matter, it has to be placed before a meeting of all the Judges. The Head Notes have to be carefully drafted and scrutinised. These processes require time and therefore a maximum time limit of two months has been fixed in the rules.

Mr. V. N. Damodaran Nambiar *(Trippunittura):* May I know, Sir, whether the Cochin Law Journal is recognised?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I don't find any such specific recognition. As a matter of fact, copies of judgments are being supplied to the Editor by the High Court and the Cochin Law Journal is freely cited in Courts and used by the Bar.

Mr. V. N. Damodaran Nambiyar *(Trippunittura):* In view of the fact that the Cochin Law Journal is being regularly published, will the Government consider the stopping of the publication?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* The Government of India have not ceased publication of the Indian Law Reports, though there are various other officers publishing Law Reports. We will fall into line with the practice in British India.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Cheruthuruthi):* I don't want to press this motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn

CUT MOTION NO. 2

Necessity of a ladies waiting room in the Trichur Munsiff's Courts

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Cheruthuruthi):* I move *to reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,810 for Establishment—Munsiffs' Court—by Re. 1.* The object of this is to take to the notice of *the Government the necessity of a ladies waiting room for parties and witnesses in the Trichur District and Munsiff's Courts.*

There are three courts adjoining the Trichur Munsiff's Court—the Munsiff Court, the District Court and the District Magistrate Court, in which also the second class Magistrate Court is located. There are no waiting sheds for witnesses or parties, either for men or for women. The men are somehow managing in the verandahs and they crowd in the verandahs—all sorts of people, along with Vakils. Even pedlars have to manage in the verandah, exposed to sun or rain, or in the shade of some trees. That is how they are managing. Men may manage. Ladies who have unfortunately to go to the court as witnesses find it very difficult to wait there at least for a few hours. The want of waiting room for witnesses was brought to the notice of the Government several times years and years back, and the Government then told that it was their policy to have these waiting sheds for the courts wherever possible, and as a matter of fact, they started in one or two places and then stopped. I therefore request the Government to start very vigorously the construction of waiting sheds and supply the Trichur court first, where at least four courts will be benefited, by the construction of one building. With these few words I commend the motion for the acceptance of this House.

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon *(Chief Engineer):* This question of providing waiting rooms in the several courts has been put forward by the member during the last budget session also, and I answered then that the question will be considered. In the year 1117, that is this year, we took up the question again for providing for these buildings in the budget. Then it was thought that on account of the war, all questions connected with the construction of the buildings may be stopped as far as possible. That is the reason why we did not make any provision in 1118 for this purpose. The Government are fully aware of the necessity of providing waiting rooms for the litigant public in the courts. On account of the war and the consequent policy of the Government to economise the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly